

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the final Office action dated March 14, 2006. Claims 1-20 were examined, all of which were rejected.

In the present Office action: claims 1-6, 8-10 and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 6,530,065 (hereinafter “McDonald”); claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0188902 (hereinafter “Fan”); and claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald and U.S. Patent No. 6,664,978 (hereinafter “Kekic”). Applicants extend their appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of a return telephone call to Applicants’ employer’s representative on May 11, 2006.

At the outset, Applicants note that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must teach each and every limitation of the claim. Applicants submit that McDonald does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicants’ independent claims and, as such, the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn. More specifically, Applicants’ independent claim 1 is directed to a computer implemented method for organizing data on a display to facilitate testing of an integrated circuit design having a plurality of electrical functions. In rejecting Applicants’ prior arguments, the Office action, at page 10, stated “McDonald teaches that information associated with a netlist is displayed as a ‘plurality of cell names’, in other words, the information or components of a circuit design are displayed as a plurality of parts, as shown in Figure 17; the plurality of parts associated with the circuit design include all the parts that are available to be included in the circuit. For example, users can choose to replace an existing part with an alternate part by selecting the ‘Select Alternate Part’ button 1708 of Figure 17, which displays a list of alternate parts that may be used for a particular component of the circuit in a pop-up window, as recited in column 13, lines 51-61. A netlist is a list of all components and interconnections of an integrated circuit. Since the parts in the list of alternative parts can be used in the design of the circuit, they are part of the list of information/components that are *associated* with the circuit design and therefore, are part of the ‘plurality of cell names’.”

Applicants agree that a netlist is a list of all components and interconnections of an integrated circuit. However, Applicants note that while McDonald Fig. 17 includes an integrated

circuit (i.e., an LM2595S), Fig. 17 (see Fig. 19) is directed to a circuit design (not an integrated circuit design) that includes a plurality of components or parts (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1), one of which is an integrated circuit (i.e., IC) and the remaining of which are discrete components (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1 and L1). Applicants respectfully submit that the McDonald parts (or part numbers) are not cell names corresponding to a plurality of electrical functions of an integrated circuit design, as is defined in Applicants' independent claim 1.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the McDonald components or parts (e.g., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1 of Fig. 17) could be equated to Applicants' plurality of cell names, it does not follow that changing a value (or characteristic) of one of the McDonald components or parts (using McDonald's "select alternate part" button to choose a different part number for a part) identifies cell names affiliated with a group differently than remaining cell names not affiliated with the group. That is, while the value (or characteristics) of one of the McDonald parts may be changed, the McDonald circuit of Fig. 17 still includes all of the parts (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1). Moreover, Applicants can find no passage in McDonald that would teach or suggest grouping less than all of the parts (e.g., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1 of Fig. 17) of a circuit for testing.

At page 10, the Office action further stated that "McDonald thus teaches that from the total list of cell names, or components/parts that are associated with the integrated circuit, there is a distinct display of two groups of cell names, i.e. one group of components that are selected, as displayed in the 'Components' section in Figure 17 and one group of components that are alternate parts, as displayed under the 'Select Alternate Part' category and shows the capability of displaying two groupings of cell names, specifically, displaying the cell names affiliated with the group of cell names to be simulated and the remaining cell names not affiliated with the group differently." As noted above, McDonald Fig. 17 is directed to a circuit design that includes an integrated circuit and not to an integrated circuit design. Moreover, McDonald does not teach or suggest displaying in a first region all of the part numbers that could be used for each of the parts (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1) in the McDonald circuit in a listing sequence. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the different part numbers available to be used in the McDonald circuit design of Fig. 17 each correspond to cell names, it still does not follow that each of the cell names would be associated with a netlist of the McDonald circuit of Fig. 17. That is, unless a

specific part number was selected for one of the parts (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1 of Fig. 17), it would seem illogical to associate the specific part number with the netlist for the McDonald circuit.

Moreover, while McDonald allows for selecting different part numbers for the parts (i.e., Cin, Cout, D1, IC and L1 of Fig. 17) by activating a "select alternate part" button, McDonald does not identify in a first of a plurality of regions (of a segmented display), cell names affiliated with a group differently than remaining cell names not affiliated with said group. As noted in the Office action, McDonald displays a list of alternate parts in a pop-up window. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants' independent claim 1 is allowable as McDonald does not teach or suggest all of the limitations, as noted above, of independent claim 1. While of different scope, Applicants' independent claims 10 and 15 are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend on allowable claims.

Claims 1-20 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></b>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
_____ Michael R. Long	_____ Date

  

<b>EXPRESS MAIL LABEL:</b> _____
----------------------------------

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Long, Reg. No. 42,808  
 Attorney for Applicant(s)  
 (512) 338-6324 (direct)  
 (512) 338-6300 (main)  
 (512) 338-6301 (fax)